PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Sonoma County Water Agency	**Amount Requested**	$ 2,000,000
Proposal Title	City Watersheds of Sonoma Valley Phase 1	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 4,135,000

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in the Fryer Creek sub-watershed of the Sonoma Creek watershed. The project is intended to alleviate flooding within the Fryer Creek sub-watershed and contain the 10-year storm event along the main stem of Fryer Creek. This will be accomplished by diverting stormwater to a 12-acre-foot multiuse detention basin on the Montini Open Space Preserve, replacing a flood-prone culvert at MacArthur Street, and improving channel capacity through strategic [vegetative] habitat enhancement. The project also intends to: reduce downstream sediment deposits; recharge groundwater; improve groundwater supply reliability; improve fish passage; and create a site for public access and education about hydrology and watershed geomorphic processes.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	**Score/ Max. Possible**	**Criteria**	**Score/ Max. Possible**
Work Plan	**12/15**	Technical Justification	**6/10**
Budget	**3/5**		
Schedule	**5/5**	Benefits and Cost Analysis	**15/30**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**5/10**
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**49**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. While the work plan includes a thorough introduction on the project and identifies the components of the project that are directly related to the goals and objectives of the Bay Area IRWM Plan, project tasks are not of adequate detail. For example, "Task 4: Assessment and Evaluation" consists of a bulleted list of work items with no narrative of how

these items will be completed. Also, the construction task lacks significant details as to how the work will be performed, such as, estimated quantities or materials needed. Many of these estimates are included in the budget, which suggests this information is available. Finally, construction, environmental compliance/mitigation/ enhancement, and construction administration tasks lack defined deliverables.

BUDGET

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Many budget items are not clearly presented and there are inconsistencies between Table A and the summary tables. The budget section is lacking an explanation of what each table contains and how each table is related. There are inconsistencies in the budget for construction as values in Table A and C for the Montini Open Space Preserve Surface Water Detention/Groundwater Recharge Basin are inconsistent. Table D for the Fryer Creek Culvert Replacement includes the sub-element component for the Restoration costs at Fryer Creek, but they are already accounted for in the Habitat Restoration line item. The Montini Open Space Preserve Trail System sub-element references Table F as backup documentation for the value listed in Table A, but Table F was not included in the application.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The schedule is reasonable and consistent with the budget and work plan. The schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction of one component of the proposal by April 2013 (the Trail System) and the remaining construction tasks will begin in June 2015.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, the identified targets for the goal of "Alleviate flooding within the Fryer Creek subwatershed and contain, at a minimum, the 10-year storm event along the main stem of Fryer Creek" are not appropriate for the goal. All, but one of the nine (9) targets, are action items for this project goal are related to tasks required to complete the project, not physical targets that will measure project performance and it is unclear how Target 9 "Measure flow reduction through the basin that meets the basin design criteria" helps meet the goal.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project and physical benefits are not well described. The applicant claims nine benefits within the project, but each physical benefit is not thoroughly developed or explained within this section. For example, there is inconsistency between benefit descriptions, with some containing a "with and without project" characterization and others not. The benefits values summarized in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 often contradict the values described in the text of the section. For example, the Upland and Wetland Habitat Area Created sections mention that 11,770 native wetland and upland species will be planted in the Project area, but Table 7.2 lists 14,770 plants.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation.

The net present value (NPV) of costs is $3.896 million. Flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits are estimated. Estimated annual damage (EAD) is about $19,000 annually or $302,324 in NPV terms. Increased water recharge is estimated to be 80 Acre-Feet per year (AFY) worth $59,200 annually. With additional wetland habitat the NPV of water supply and wetland habitat is about $834,000. Benefits of avoided project costs are also discussed, but CIP-1 is about the same project as the one proposed. In Table 17, only the value of FDR, water supply and habitat are claimed for a NPV of $1,136,015. Possibly, the sediment removal avoided costs should be included here for a total benefit of $1,273,863. This monetized benefit is much less than project costs of $3,895,842. Some of the water supply benefit may not be a benefit from the State perspective if, without project, it would be captured by downstream beneficial uses. A number of non-monetized benefits are also claimed and are well-documented.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

The applicant claimed one program preference and six statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for only five of the preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (3) Climate Change Response Actions; (4) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (5) Practice Integrated Flood Management.